DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 825 SP 002 607

By-Bhaerman, Robert D.

Several Educators' Cure for the Common Cold, Among Other Things, or One Unionist View of Staff Differentiation.

American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Apr 69
Note-17p.
Available from-American Federation of Teachers, 1012 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 (Free)
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.95
Descriptors-*Differentiated Staffs, Inservice Teacher Education, Teacher Certification, Teacher Salaries

The assumption that instructional responsibility is to be gauged and compensated for on the basis of the specialty of teaching tasks is the most unacceptable thesis of differentiated staffing because of the difficulty of determining the relative degree of importance of the various teaching roles (e.g., curriculum developer, applier of research, classroom instructor). A more realistic alternative to professionally unsound hierarchical arrangements would be one which places the differentiated tasks of the specialists (in media, in diagnosis, in instructional technique) and the "generalists" on a horizontal continuum. And until we find a workable and justifiable alternative, the present salary schedule concept is the only manageable choice we have--unless we consider one schedule for both teachers and administrators. Stabilization of the teaching profession will first require (1) a reinforcement of the attitude that teaching is a cooperative, fraternal effort calling for solidarity among teachers, and (2) an effort by teachers and administrators to encounter the divisiveness evident in vertical certification and vertical differentiation plans. A Continuous Progress Alternative to the hierarchical ladders should be developed in the form of individualized inservice education programs--within a framework of certification justice for all teachers. (Included are further suggestions for certification and inservice education changes plus the results of a pilot study on the relative importance of various teaching roles.) (JS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM T
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINI
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATIO
POSITION OR POLICY.

ED029825

# SEVERAL EDUCATORS' CURE FOR THE COMMON COLD, AMONG OTHER THINGS
## or
## One Unionist View of Staff Differentiation

Dr. Robert D. Bhaerman
Director of Research
American Federation of Teachers

Actually I could have called this article "LSD, Educator's Style". The "L" would have stood for Lionizing, for that is precisely what so many fellow educators have done with the concept of staff differentiation. "LSD" would have been appropriate, too, since the theory currently is riding "high" in a few relatively small communities in urban America, one southern state, and on several college campuses stretching from Stanford to Massachusetts.

In spite of the rumblings which have been made in a comparatively short time, relatively little has been written on this topic. What has, however, is extremely provocative. The concept is a stimulating one, one which has a good deal going for it. Unfortunately, most differentiated staffing models create more problems than they were intended to resolve.

Some of the more positive goals of differentiated staffing are legitimate, for example:

- it provides a setting in which personnel can compliment each other...and they should;
- it provides a way for teachers to learn to teach on the job...an excellent idea;
- it makes possible a wider variety of career patterns...note patterns, not ladders. Incidentally, Bruce Eckman, the current president of the Association of Classroom Teachers said, "They ought to take that ladder and lay it on its side." Not a bad idea.

SP002607

- it provides ways of utilizing a wide range of talent in the community and the school and it suggests other routes for becoming a member of the profession besides the formal route of college preparation as it is now conceived...and this is good.

As a matter of fact, redefining the traditional role of the teacher, distinguishing new responsibilities, and creating new specializations for the profession may be just the thing we need. But when we set about to establish hierarchies, we are saying that to arrive at the status of a teacher is an insufficient career goal. Is this because the teacher is treated insufficiently in more ways than one?

Many of the goals of differentiated staffing can be achieved apart from the destructive elements of most models. In doing so, it will be necessary to distinguish between the concepts of the vertical hierarchy and horizontal differentiation.

Most of the criticisms of differentiated staffing which I have read, are well-founded, e.g., the Florida Federation of Teachers has developed a well-thought out position paper, which included these following points:

Differentiated staffing was created to serve not student needs but administrator convenience.

Any proposal for improving education which does not first question student's needs is a facade, a disguise for the motives of those proposing the change. Differentiated staffing may be a method to ease the administrator's problems of attracting and keeping good teachers, but it is not tailored to fit educational need and was never intended to be.

Differentiated staffing embodies the philosophy and weaknesses of merit pay.

Supposedly, differentiated staffing differs from merit pay because it rewards the assumption of additional responsibilities. However, since only a limited number of elite positions are available, and since not all teachers who want additional responsibility may assume it, differentiated staffing resurrects the heart of the merit pay controversy. Who decides which teachers may enter the new elite? Under differentiated staffing teachers will be forced into the position where the most effective bootlicker will be promoted. Political skullduggery by teachers will be rewarded to the detriment of children. Once again the teacher who wishes to spend all his time working with children will be underpaid.

Differentiated staffing does not reward all qualified teachers who seek advancement.

Only a limited number of positions are available for teacher promotions. If teachers in upper levels remain in their positions, teachers below them hierarchically, no matter how interested or how qualified, cannot be promoted. The only opportunity for advancement for members of lower echelons would be to move out of the system or into administration.

Most critics of differentiated staffing believe that educational improvement must begin with less grandiose schemes and that real improvement must be based upon applying greater resources to solve the problems we are equipped to solve. It does not begin by diffusing tax money on solutions which intensify rather than eliminate existing problems.

But I will leave the main debate to others in order to concentrate on an issue which, for some reason, seems strangely missing from the past debate. I will focus attention on what I believe is the heart of the matter. The basic assumption of differentiated staffing is embodied in the statement made by several writers on this topic, namely, that there should be various levels of responsibility and that the more difficult the responsibility, the greater the compensation. The distinguishing feature in gauging responsibility and compensation would be the specialty of the teaching task. This assumption is at the root of the problem and is, no doubt, the most unacceptable thesis of differentiated staffing.

To begin, I raise this question: Who is the most important person in accomplishing a mission over Vietnam --the pilot, the navigator, or the bombardier? Without each one performing his unique role, the mission is aborted. Now these three may play a more significant role than the stewardess - if one goes along on these kinds of flights (a para-professional?), but frankly I find it impossible to judge which one carries the most difficult responsibility. In other words, we can elaborate various teacher responsibilities to our heart's content; judging their relative importance is not so easy.

Who is most important in a symphony orchestra: the first violinist; the cellist; tympanist; -- in teaching: the curriculum developer, the applier of research, or the classroom instructor; -- the pilot, the navigator, the bombardier? Herbert Spencer, on the question "What knowledge is of Most Worth?" (Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical; London: G. Manwaring, 1861, pp. 7-9), wrote;

> Our first step must obviously be to classify, in the order of their importance, the leading kinds of activity which constitute human life. They may be naturally arranged into: --1. those activities which directly minister to self-preservation; 2. those activities which, by securing the necessaries of life, indirectly minister to self-preservation; 3. those activities which have for their end the rearing and discipline of offspring; 4. those activities which are involved in the maintenance of proper social and political relations; 5. those miscellaneous activities which fill up the leisure part of life, devoted to the gratification of the tastes and feelings.
>
> That these stand in something like their true order of subordination, it needs no long consideration to show.

I believe it is not as simple as all that. While this is not the place for entry into a philosophic discussion of self-preservation, I quote Spencer because I feel that to determine the true order of subordination for teaching roles takes somewhat longer consideration than we have given it up to now.

John Dewey also had something to say on this topic. (John Dewey, Democracy and Education; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916, pp. 279-280.):

> We cannot establish a hierarchy of values among studies. It is futile to attempt to arrange them in an order, beginning with one having least worth and going on to that of maximum value. Insofar as it marks a characteristic enrichment of life, its worth is intrinsic or incomparable. Since education is not a means to living, but is identical with the operation of living a life which is fruitful and inherently significant, the only ultimate value which can be set up is just the process of living itself. And this not an end to which studies and activities are subordinate means; it is the whole of which they are ingredients...

I would add this thought: the process of teaching is the whole of which there there are many irreplaceable and incomparable ingredients. I believe the value

scheme of a number of fellow educators--in regard to teaching, to developing curriculum, and to applying research--is really misconceived. I personally find it impossible to judge the most important among those tasks; none is of lesser or greater value then any other.

Incidentally, Ernest Bayles also had something worthwhile to say about relativistic value-theory in Democratic Educational Theory (1960), p. 103:

> If I really like and want oysters, more than anything else in the world, then indeed shall I be willing to trade anything for oysters. If and when I find something which I am not willing to trade for oysters, I have found something which I value more highly than I do oysters...There are times when oysters appear to be worth much; there are others, possibly, when we would be distressed to have them about. Thus, values are taken to be humanly determined; a function of time, place and person.

Categorizing teacher roles, like enjoying oysters, should not be regarded as a cosmic absolute. Which of three or four values outranks the others will depend on which one is the better instrument for achieving a given objective, e.g., growth of children, knowledge, and abilities. A hierarchycannot be established so easily for that goal.

H.H. McAshan in a paper called "Differentiated Staffing: Questions and Answers", suggested that careful study of the main ingredients of differentiated staffing should be completed prior to its adaption and implementation.

I am not certain that this has been done to any great degree. Therefore, during the late winter of 1968, I conducted a pilot study on this issue. I attempted to analyze the assumption upon which most differentiated models rest, i.e., the hierarchy concept. I took what has been described as the various roles and responsibilities of master teachers, senior teachers, staff teachers, etc., and developed the following set of directions:

Listed below are (x) statements which describe some of the major roles and responsibilities of elementary and secondary school classroom teachers, as described in selected, current educational writings. The purpose of this short pilot instrument is to determine the relative degree of importance for each role, that is, in relation to the others. While in some cases it may be difficult to rank these statements in the order of importance, it is essential to attempt to determine your opinion regarding the level of importance which you ascribe to each task. (They should be ranked from 1 to (x) with 1 being the "most important function" and (x) being relatively "least important function", even though you may feel there is not a great degree of difference between first and last.

I did not identify the pilot study as coming from the AFT because I did not wish to inject any bias, one way or the other, into this survey. Unfortunately, this may have occurred if it were so identfied. (Note: #1) Four forms were developed so that I would be utilizing the exact language and categories which have been used to describe the common differentiated staffing patterns, e.g., form MS consisted of ten descriptive statements utilizing the master-senior-staff teacher hierarchy language. Form RC represented the teaching research-teaching curriculum-staff teacher hierarchy. Form, BM utilized McKenna's staffing concept, and form AR utilized the four-level hierarchy resented by Allen and Ryan in the November 1966 report, "A Perspective on the Education of Teachers in California in 1980" (Note: #2) The initial statistical analysis, a frequency distribution, is revealing. I call the readers attention to the position of the staff teacher in forms MS, RC and AR, and to the clustering in form BM, which is not a hierarchical concept in and of itself as are the other models. (Note: #3)

I do not make any pretense that this was only a pilot survey and I do not claim to draw any sweeping generalizations from the initial analysis. Nevertheless, two questions come to mind as a result of the investigation: (1) Are we certain that the hierarchical arrangement is both philosophically and empirically valid? (2) Have we followed McAshan's suggestion: Was careful study of the main ingredient completed prior to its adaptation and implementation--in Temple City and elsewhere--careful philosophical and careful empirical analysis?

If nothing else, perhaps this exploratory survey might provoke the kind of research which is needed before other communities commit themselves and their finances to the major restructuring of the profession. A great deal more research must be done before such a commitment is made. This is not to say that restructuring is unnecessary. I hope I have conveyed in this article the belief that concepts about teaching must be constantly scrutinized. The structure of the profession is not sacrosanct. I am merely offering the suggestion that changes in its structure should be based upon sound philosophic thinking and empirical analysis.

It is not difficult to see what the basic problem is, namely, the confusion surrounding the question, "What is a teacher?" Dwight Allen of the University of Massachusetts describes the present staffing system as "a teacher is a teacher is a teacher". He has stated that educators should recognize individual differences in teaching tasks, just as they attempt to do in students...and I certainly agree with him on this point. But, I believe the heart of the matter is not so much what you call teaching, but how you view it and, more importantly, how you treat it. That is to say, teaching will be less of a profession if we continue to treat it and support it in the substandard ways to which we have become accustomed.

Surely there must be a more realistic alternative to professionally unsound hierarchical arrangements. Such an alternative would be based upon legitimate differentiation, for example, an arrangement based upon differentiated assignments and tasks on a horizontal continuum:

<u>p r o f e s s i o n a l  t e a c h e r s</u>

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a media specialist | a specialist in diagnosing | a specialist in instructional techniques | a good old fashioned "generalist", a renaissance type, the kind we we need more of | etc. |

A teacher is <u>not</u> a teacher is <u>not</u> a teacher. Some are specialists, some are generalists; some are "facilitators of behavior development", some are "developers of talent and aptitudes", some are "identifiers of talents," some are "liberal

enlighteners", and others are "technologists who administer basic skills and knowledges". But they all should be expert in their areas. And, it seems to me, that with the aid of expert supervision and in-service training, all teachers to some degree should be able to translate "theory into classroom possibilities". After all, it is the staff teacher who is in the classroom all of the time, hence, it is he who must translate theory into practice.

The question of the relationship of salaries to the hierarchical levels must be considered. It would be ideal if we had the profound wisdom to be able to distinguish teacher effectiveness-and pay accordingly. My purpose is not to spell out how evaluation of competencies can be done. Others are. I support the work of those scholars who are striving to develop more reliable and valid devices. While I am concerned, obviously, with how evaluation is done technically, I am as much concerned with when it is done, by whom it is done,aand the framework and spirit in which it is done. (Incidentally, when the TEPS people say, "Evaluation is a sticky business," everyone nods their heads in agreement. When the AFT says it and tells why, all hell breaks loose.)

Nevertheless I am skeptical, for I believe we may never be able to arrive at a workable consensus on values in this realm any easier than we can in any other realm. Do we evaluate the "cognitive" effects of teachers? the "affective" effects? both? This is a terrifying problem which may never be resolved satisfactorily. The burden of proof is on the researchers who are trying to develop the sophisticated instruments for the measurement of competency. I wish them well in their efforts. But for the time being, we are left with a choice: to pay teachers according to the role they fulfill (who can judge priorities here?) or to pay teachers according to their academic and experience background (realizing the inequities which may exist here). Until we have found a workable and justifiable alternative, the salary schedule concept as we know it now is the only meaningful choice we have.

If any salary schedule changes are contemplated, perhaps we should consider the benefits of one schedule for all school personnel: teachers and administrators. Who is to say which is the most significant role? Remove one brick from the base of a structure and it will collapse. Teaching is not competitive; it is a co-operative and communal effort and so it should remain. Nothing must be injected to create divisiveness.

In short, we should attack the problem at the source: if the majority of teachers are not the most able or skillful, let us get to the root of the problem by identifying, recruiting and developing the "raw material" into truly first class personnel who are able teachers. Instead, we concoct a hierarchy and create even more serious problems.

I believe that two positive prerequisites are necessary for the stabilization of the teaching profession: (1.) A reinforcement of the attitude which I learned in my first education course-that teaching is cooperative and fraternal effort, one which calls for solidarity among teachers. While teachers may perform different roles, their unified force should be directed toward improving the status of children's learning and of the profession's well-being. (2.) A demonstration of courage on the part of both teachers and administrators to encounter the divisiveness evident in vertical certification and vertical differentiation plans.

I reject those vertical plans and offer in their place the following plan of my own to compliment the two attitudinal requirements stated above:

(1.) A teacher certification arrangement in which the state would require superior college-level preparation for certification, provide for expert supervision of beginning teachers for a period of at least three years, and then remove itself from further certification activity. In turn, local school systems would provide the stimulus, where needed, to encourage teachers to continue their education for improved competence. Presently, in many states teachers must secure additional

college credit in order to continue the initial teaching certificate in force or to make it "permanent". This practice involves a type of coercion that does not lead to professional responsibility. The stamina and the dedication to complete three or four years of successful teaching, plus the optimum collegiate preparation necessary for regular initial certification, should be sufficient grounds for extending a certificate. The concept of certification as a dual-step process with continuing certification granted after a three-or four-year probationary period would not lead to the divisiveness of the multi-level certification scheme.

(2.) An inservice education arrangement in which specialization can be obtained by those who wish it and continued professional growth can be achieved by all. However, inservice approaches must not be more of the same old things. They must be meaningful and significant and, to as complete a degree as possible, they must be personalized and individualized. It is trite to say that teachers must be continuously alert to the many new insights into educational theory, the learning process and instructional technology. Teachers obviously must never stop growing or they are dead. A way must be found to assure this growth. The question is not whether they do or whether they do not. It is: What is the fairest, most mature, and most professional way to insure professional growth. Obsolescence of skills can be overcome without the restrictions imposed by rigid certification levels and forced renewal.

I believe an alternative to hierarchical staffing exist; I choose to call it the Continuous Progress Alternative. Let me explain why.

One of the most meaningful statements dealing with individual differences introduces the widely read book, The Non-Graded Elementary School, by Goodlad and Anderson:

> Greek mythology tells us of the cruel robber, Procrustes (the stretcher). When travelers sought his house for shelter, they were tied onto an iron bedstead. If the traveler was shorter than the bed, Procrustes stretched him out until he was the same length as the bed. If he was longer, his limbs were chopped off to make him fit. Procrustes shaped both short and tall until they were equally long and equally dead.

If personalized and individualized education makes sense for students, the same principles should apply to teachers. If independent study has proven valuable for students--and it has--it also should have value for teachers. Total self-development for all teachers in significant inservice programs is the alternative. Among other things, these programs must include contractual arrangements for travel, books, and materials for teachers, and structured and unstructured workshops and institutes in which teachers would come to know such meaningful concepts as interaction analysis, inquiry training, sensitivity training and the like. In other words, we must develop teacher talent-as we do student talent-not just "grade" it.

The alternative is based upon the idea of self-development, with teachers diagnosing their own needs and establishing their own self-growth programs, the basis of which, quite logically, would be self-evaluation. Teachers would assess their own strengths and weaknesses and establish their own self-improvement programs in a truly professional way.

I can accept evaluation of competencies, if by this one means self-evaluation. I can accept the idea of a horizontally differentiated staff, if we can be certain that no discrimination exists, financial or otherwise. I can accept the challenge to overcome obsolescence of teaching skills, but we must do this in the most professional way. To date, the concept of continuous progress has been applied to public school children, but not as an alternative for public school teachers.

Serious dilemmas call for far-reaching solutions, and I do not believe these goals are impractical. Granted, they call for a great amount of self-discipline and maturity on the part of teachers and administrators, but I think it can be done. Meaningful inservice education should be the alternative to the hierarchical ladder. Teachers would remain in the profession, and would be career teachers in the finest sense of the word, if they were provided with programs of self-growth which significant on-the-job training could provide. This is a public trust.

Let me illustrate further: When I was a teacher education adviser in Pennsylvania, one of my chief responsibilities was to analyze programs under the approved program approach. In some cases, the Bureau of Teacher Education suggested (gently) that certain programs gradually be phased out. It may sound surprising, but the Department of Public Instruction never mandated that a program be dropped. The approach for dropping programs was through mutual agreement between the parties. When the college came to realize that a satisfactory job was not being done in a specific program, it would be dropped. Mutually it was agreed that colleges would develop only those programs for which they were resonably strong. I view this as being analogous to the problems of staffing.

To illustrate: Utilizing self-evaluation devices, teachers would build their own self-development programs by identifying their own strengths and weaknesses. If a certain weakness was glaring, the teacher would agree not to teach in that area. For example, a history teacher may be very weak in European history; he should teach soley in the area of his strength, let us say American history, until the weakness could be corrected. Realizing this, he would set up a self-study program in which he would develop the knowledge to teach European history. A few teachers might be asked to leave the profession, but that decision would be mutually arrived at. It is my sincere belief, however, that not that many teachers will be found so lacking that they could not work effectively in some area. If one cannot work with children at a particular age level, perhaps he can do better at another level. If one cannot instruct well, perhaps he can diagnose well. Rather than be dropped down the certification ladder, or dropped entirely, his career goals should be mutually redirected.

I am reminded of a doctor whom I know who simply could not relate to his patients. He had no bedside manner. He came to realize this himself and, hence, spent additional time in his own training in order to specialize as a radiologist. While he could not

relate to patients, he could relate to X-rays. Do not misunderstand: I am not suggesting that we protect the incompetent. I am suggesting that teachers be treated as human beings who can learn, grow, and change in their chosen career. The important thing is that teachers be selected and recruited in ways which provide as much as possible that the clearly incompetent person would not be allowed to teach in the first place. Selection and recruitement, too, are part of the Continuous Progress Alternative.

This alternative is built upon the idea of the professionalism of teachers. It is built upon the concept that, although teachers may be performing different activities, they must be considered and must consider themselves as teachers, whether they are program developers or program implementers. We talk glibly about stressing cooperation among students. Here is an opportunity to practice what we preach by stressing the same among teachers.

Sarah Lawrence College, for one, has shown that academic ranks at the college level need not be identified or get in the way of a professor's work. This, too, is true, I feel for public school teachers. Each teacher, no matter what else some people may call him, is performing a vital and irreplaceable part of a broad scheme, namely, he provides for children's learning. On one hand we must depart from the view of a teacher as an isolated unit, but, on the other hand, we must not conceive of teachers as lesser beings for not being higher up the ladder.

To summarize the Continuous Progress Alternative means:

.meaningful inservice programs contractually provided for;
.personalized and individualized inservice education;
.independent study;
.travel;
.purchase of professional books and materials;
.meaningful workshops and institutes;

.regularly established sabbaticals;
.research into instructional problems;
.staff-development laboratories for analyzing and solving instructional problems;
.self-development;
.self-evaluation;
.self-improvement;
.mutual agreement on teaching assignment;
.mutual agreement on the direction of self-development programs;
.renewed concentration on selection;
.renewed concentration on recruitment;
.cooperation among teachers;
.teachers and teaching as part of a coordinated effort.

Many approaches are needed to resolve the problems of teacher dropout and provision of career incentives. Hierarchical plans of certification and staffing offer a thesis. We reject the divisiveness to which they lead. Instead we must fashion a synthesis, a comprehensive program of meaningful preservice and inservice education--within the framework of certification justice for all teachers. The differentiated staffing concept is too simple a solution for the many complex problems of teacher selection, recruitment, retention, teacher education and certification. Yet, it promises to do just about everything except cure the common cold. Frankly, I think we can do better, not by focusing on one narrow organizational pattern, but by attacking on many fronts the many problems which face us. What we can do to resolve some of these problems is only restricted by the limits of our imagination. The hierarchy concept is an imaginative idea. But I doubt if it is the last word or the best.

NOTES:

(#1) Participants In The Pilot Survey: (146 total)

a. Elementary School Teachers (74)
Secondary School Teachers (52)
College Professors (13)
Administrators (7)

b. Age: 20 - 29 (70)
30 - 44 (47)
45 - 65 (20)
65 - over (1)

c. Male (58)
Female (75)

d. Members of professional organizations:

| | |
|---|---|
| NEA | (86) |
| AFT | (3) |
| AASA | (4) |
| Others | (misc.) |

e. Type of Community:

| | |
|---|---|
| rural | (22) |
| suburban | (10) |
| urban | (50) |

(#2) Descriptive Items On Differentiated Staff Roles:

Teaching Research Associates:

brings constant flow of ideas emanating from research centers, universities, etc.; introduces new concepts and ideas into the school.

establishes and maintains a continual program of research and evaluation in the areas of curriculum development and new methodologies.

works in developing curriculum which incorporates the latest research.

Teaching Curriculumn Associates:

modifies national curriculum studies to meet local needs and local teacher proclivities.

develops new curriculum material which might become part of a districts educational program.

Staff Teacher:

plans daily for groups, meets individual needs, keeps classroom control, maintains pupil rapport, selects and organizes materials, and confers with pupils and parents.

translates curriculum units and goals into highly teachable lesson plans and is responsible for carrying out these plans.

puts educational innovations into effect in the classroom and subjects them to the modifications which arise from day to day experience.

Master Teacher:

applies promising research-tested ideas to improve the school.

feeds into the school a steady flow of relevant new practices and curriculum content to keep the school abreast of the times.

shapes the curriculum, researches new instructional techniques, and investigates new modes of learning.

initiates research programs of a purely district interest among his colleagues.

Senior Teacher:

makes the concepts and goals of the curriculum explicit for a given course or grade level.

evaluates critically pertinent research and from it selects those ideas, practices, and principles that will contribute to the development of new methods and new programs.

diagnoses learning problems and specializes in the relation of new teaching strategies to needs of the learner.

McKenna's Model:

Teacher Technologist: Skill in administering basic skills and knowledges.

Liberal Enlightener: Skill as a master presenter.

Identifier of Talents: Skill in promoting exploration in broad fields.

Developer of Talents and Aptitudes: A skill for developing talent.

Facilitator of Attitude and Interpersonal Behavior Development: human relations attitudes and skills.

Allen and Ryan's Model (1966):

Curriculum associate-anticipator: Shapes curriculum. Gives direction to what curriculum should be in the future and how subjects should be related to each other.

Senior Teacher-conceptualizer: Makes explicit the concepts and goals in each course or grade level.

Staff Teacher-illustrator: Translates units and goals into highly teachable lesson plans.

Associate Teacher-doer: Carries out the given plans.

(#3)

## Tabulation of Results of the Pilot Survey on Teacher Roles (frequency distributions) :

### FORM MS

| | Master Teacher | Senior Teacher | Staff Teacher |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - 2 | 6 | 25 |
| 2 - 5 | 10 | 18 |
| 3 - 9 | 9 | 15 |
| 4 - 7 | 14 | 12 |
| 5 - 10 | 11 | 10 |
| 6 - 16 | 14 | 3 |
| 7 - 12 | 11 | 10 |
| 8 - 18 | 13 | 3 |
| 9 - 23 | 8 | 3 |
| 10 - 30 | 3 | 0 |
| average | 7.15 | 5.36 | 3.44 |

| | Teaching Research Associate | Teaching Curriculum Associate | Staff Teacher |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - 6 | 0 | 27 |
| 2 - 8 | 1 | 24 |
| 3 - 14 | 4 | 15 |
| 4 - 14 | 11 | 8 |
| 5 - 16 | 11 | 6 |
| 6 - 14 | 12 | 7 |
| 7 - 18 | 7 | 8 |
| 8 - 9 | 20 | 4 |
| average | 4.89 | 5.97 | 3.05 |

### FORM AR

| | Curriculum Associate | Senior Teacher | Staff Teacher | Associate Teacher |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - 11 | 13 | 6 | 6 |
| 2 - 7 | 12 | 12 | 5 |
| 3 - 5 | 9 | 14 | 8 |
| 4 - 13 | 2 | 4 | 17 |
| average | 2.56 | 2.00 | 2.44 | 3.00 |

### FORM BM

| | Facilitator of Attitudes | Developer of Talent | Identifier of Talent | Liberal Enlightener | Teacher Technologist |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 - 7 | 3 | 9 | 16 | 3 |
| 2 - 5 | 11 | 7 | 6 | 9 |
| 3 - 12 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 7 |
| 4 - 6 | 9 | 9 | 3 | 11 |
| 5 - 8 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 8 |
| average | 3.08 | 3.26 | 2.84 | 2.50 | 3.26 |